

## REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 6-21, 25, 28-29, 32-33, 36-37 and 40-43 are currently pending in the application. Of these, claims 10, 13-17, 42 and 43 have been canceled by way of this Response. The Examiner's withdrawal of the rejection of the claims based on the Moriwaki reference is acknowledged with appreciation. However, new rejections have been made, which will be discussed individually below.

Claims 1, 2, 6-21, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 37 and 40-43 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 6 was rejected as depending from a canceled claim. Accordingly, the dependency has been amended herewith to recite that the claim depends from Claim 2 rather than Claim 5.

The Examiner stated that Claims 8 and 9 were "not necessary as they do not further limit the preamble language of independent claim 1, which states, 'An airbag fabric for incorporation within an airbag cushion'". However, the Applicant maintains that the claims do in fact limit the independent claim, since the independent claim relates to a *fabric*, whereas claims 8 and 9 recite an actual airbag cushion. It may be that these products are provided at separate levels of the supply chain, and thus, it may be that one claim would be appropriately assertable against one party, while the other claim would not. Therefore, Applicant maintains that these claims are proper.

Claim 10 was rejected as being duplicative of Claim 6; accordingly, it has been canceled by way of this Response.

Claim 11 was rejected as not being needed; it has been amended by way of this Response to depend from Claim 6.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected as failing to further limit the language of Claim 1. Claim 12 is believed to be appropriate for the same reasons discussed above with respect to Claims 8 and 9. Claim 13 has been canceled.

Claim 14 was rejected as depending from a canceled claim. Claims 14-17 have been canceled herewith.

Claims 29, 32, 33, 36 and 37 were rejected as already being claimed. However, Claim 29 depends from Claim 25, and the verbiage is not identical to any of the other claims; therefore it is respectfully requested that the claims be retained. Applicant is permitted to claim the invention using a variety of terminologies.

Claims 42 and 43 were rejected; these claims have been canceled by way of this Response.

Claims 1, 2, 6-21, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 37 and 40-43 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Parker US 2002/0065367 A1. As noted by the Examiner, this application and the Parker application are commonly assigned. The Examiner asserts that Parker's coating could be used on any fabric, and asserts that though the cover factor is not specifically disclosed in the Parker reference, it "must be inherent to the article." Applicant respectfully disagrees. As conceded by the Examiner, there is no discussion of cover factor in the Parker reference. In fact, Parker teaches away from the invention. Parker describes a coating of hard rubber dissolved in toluene, designed to be scrape coated onto a fabric. As will be readily appreciated by those of ordinary skill in the art, this would require a relatively high cover factor as compared with that of the claimed invention, since otherwise the coating would simply seep through the fabric. Therefore, it is maintained that Parker fails to disclose or suggest a low cover factor of the variety set forth in Applicant's claims, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6-21, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 37, and 40-43 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over US Patent No. 5,470,106 to Nishimura et al. Specifically, the Examiner references Col. 10 of Nishimura, stating that it teaches a cover factor of 1,050 to 1,400. In fact, as set forth in Col. 10 of Nishimura, they state that "the woven fabric exhibits a cover factor

of 1,050 to 1,400 **both in the warp and weft directions thereof**" (emphasis added), and that "it is preferable that the warp and weft densities of the woven fabric be equal to or close to each other." Therefore, Nishimura in fact teaches a fabric cover factor of two times 1,050 to 1,400, or 2,100 to 2,800. Therefore, Nishimura fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention.